European Journal of Business and Management
ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online)
Vol.5, No.13, 2013

The Effect of Destination Image on Destination Loyalty: An Application In Alanya

Savaş Artuğer[1*] Burçin Cevdet Çetinsöz[2] İbrahim Kılıç[3]
1. Gaziosmanpaşa University, Zile Dinçerler School of Tourism and Hotel Management, Tokat, Turkey.
2. Mersin University, Vocational School /Tourism and Hotel Management, Mersin,Turkey.
3. Afyon Kocatepe University, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Afyon, Turkey.
[*] E-mail of corresponding author: artugersavas@yahoo.com

Abstract
The aim of this study was to examine the impact the destination image of Alanya district which is a district of Antalya, one of the main tourism centers in Turkey had on establishing destination loyalty. The sampling group of the study consists of tourists who visited Alanya district of Antalya between the months of June and August in 2012. A survey containing scales pertaining to destination image and destination loyalty was used as a data collection tool for the application and the collected data were analyzed by benefiting from statistical techniques such as factor analysis, reliability analysis, arithmetical average, standard deviation, Pearson correlation analysis and regression analysis. The study concluded that there was a positive and strong affiliation between the destination image which was reported as positive in general by the participants and destination loyalty and that cognitive image had a greater impact on establishing destination loyalty than affective image.
Key Words: Destination image, cognitive image, affective image, destination loyalty, Alanya

1. Introduction

Tourism is one of the sectors which have an important contemporary input in the economic progress of countries. In addition to reviving the numerous sectors it is affiliated with, the tourism sector generates jobs and revenue sources. On the other hand in addition to the changes and innovations in the demographic, socio-economic and technological fields in tourism the competition among tourist destinations has increased significantly during recent years. In this context the perceived images of destinations hold a significant place in terms of competitiveness on the market (Martin & del Bosque, 2008). As many countries are endeavoring to develop their country images in order to be able to compete with other destinations the image of destinations has become an important subject in the market research of the tourism sector (Castro, Armario, & Ruiz, 2007).

One of the most important elements for tourism managers is understanding tourist behavior. If tourists can be persuaded to return to a destination this will ensure both more revenue and an opportunity to establish closer relationships with the tourists (Petrick, 2004).

Studies which have been carried out (Chon, 1990,1992; Court & Lupton, 1997; Baloğlu & McCleary, 1999; Bigne, I. Sanchez, & J. Sanchez, 2001; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Choi, Tkachenko, & Sil, 2011) show that destination image has an impact on the destination selection process of tourists and on their intentions to revisit a destination. A positive image is established at the conclusion of a positive travel experience and this ensures that the tourists assess the destination as positive. Destination image has an impact on the behavioral intention of tourists. More importantly it contributes to tourists in revisiting the same destination (Chi & Qu, 2008).

The aim of this study was to determine the relationship between destination image and destination loyalty by examining the impact the destination image of Alanya district which is a district of Antalya, one of the main tourism centers in Turkey had on establishing destination loyalty. It is believed that the results from the study will contribute to literature as well as relevant agencies, organizations and administrators.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Destination Image

The concept of image has been studied for years in areas such as marketing, customer behavior (Stepchenkova & Morrison, 2008). There are various definitions available in literature regarding image. According to del Bosque, Martin, and Collado (2006) image is the result from the perception customers have in terms of a company. In other words, the image of a company consists of the impressions, beliefs and feelings a person has toward any given company.

According to Nguyen and Leblanc (2001) image is the full extent of the impressions which an enterprise has left in the mind of consumers. The impact an image has on the mind of the consumer materializes with the impact

established by the conglomeration of advertising, public relations, word-of-mouth advertising and through the experiences consumers have with the goods and services. The image of an enterprise is a significant variable which can have a positive or negative effect on the marketing activities of the enterprise (Kandampully & Suhartanto, 2000). The image of an enterprise has a major role in the marketing of the products and services of the enterprise, in being accepted by the target groups, in being a well known name in the relevant market, having a long marketing life and enhancing its market share (Bayuk & Küçük, 2008).

The first studies dealing with the concept of image in tourism were realized in the early 1970's by Hunt (1971), Mayo (1973) and Gunn (1972) (Stepchenkova & Morrison, 2008). The analysis and assessment of destination image is important in terms of understanding tourist behavior. Many studies have revealed that image plays a major role in the selection of a destination (Beerli & Martin, 2004). Destination image has been defined in different ways by different authors in literature. These authors and their definitions are given in Table 1 (Martin & del Bosque, 2008).

TABLE 1. Definitions of Destination Image

Author	***Definition***
Chon (1990)	The personal beliefs, opinions, feelings and impressions a person has as a result of interaction with a place.
Dadgostar and Isotalo (1992)	The impressions and attitudes a person has about a place.
Milmam and Pizam (1995)	The visual or cognitive impressions a community has about a product or place.
Lawson and Baud-Bovy (1977)	The impressions, prejudices, feelings or information a person has about a specific place.
Baloğlu and MCcleary (1999)	The information, feelings and impressions persons have about a destination.
Coshall (2000)	The perceptions people have about a destination.
Kim and Richarson (2003)	The feelings, impressions, opinions and emotions about a place people have which develop with time.

Source: Martin, S. H. ve del Bosque, I. A. R. (2008) "Exploring The Cognitive–Affective Nature of Destination Image and The Role of Psychological Factors in Its Formation", *Tourism Management*, 29, 263–277.

Destination image consists of two components. These are cognitive image and affective image. While cognitive image reflects the information or beliefs a person has about a destination (Baloğlu, 1999), affective image portrays the emotions or feelings a person about a destination (Chen & Uysal, 2002; Kim & Richardson, 2003). The cognitive component generally emerges as a result of an assessment of the physical characteristics of a place and the people living there and the events which took place. The affective component emerges as a result of an assessment of the emotions which are inspired by a place in people and the meaning it has. The general image of a destination is established as a result of a cognitive and affective assessment of the destination (İlban, Köroğlu, & Bozok, 2008).

The previous studies only took the cognitive image into consideration in measuring the image of a destination. However, the studies executed within recent years took both cognitive image as well as affective image into consideration in the scale of destination image (Martin & del Bosque, 2008). Different authors have taken different dimensions into consideration in measuring cognitive image (Wang, Lin, & Liu, 2011). Whereas affective image is usually measured with urban vitality, the place being exciting and interesting (Baloğlu & Mangaloğlu, 2001; Martin & del Bosque, 2008; Moon, Kim, & Lee, 2011). The dimensions used by various authors in measuring cognitive image are given in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Dimensions of Destination Image (cognitive image)

Author/Study Destination	*Dimensions*
Baloğlu and McClary (1999)/ Turkey, Greece, Italy, Egypt	1. Quality of experiences, 2. attractions, 3. the environment
Beerli and Martin (2004)/ Lanzarote	1. Natural and cultural resources, 2. Infra and superstructure, 3. Atmosphere, 4. Social environment, 5. Sun and sand
Martin and del Bosque (2008)/ Cantabria	1. Infrastructure and socio-economic environment, 2. Atmosphere, 3. Natural environment, 4. Cultural environment
Qu, Kim, and Im (2011)/ Oklahama	1. Quality of experiences, 2. Touristic attractiveness, 3. Environment and infrastructure, 4. Entertainment/outdoor activities, 5. Cultural traditions

Source: Wang, Y-C., Lin, W-R., Yeh, Pi-H. ve Liu, C-R. (2011) "The Role of Destination Image in Forming of Destination Loyalty at Leisure farm: Difference Between first-time and Repeat Visitors", 2nd International Conference on Sustainable Tourism Management of TDS, MJU, Thailand, 23 May. http://iscthlr.turismo.wu-wien.ac.at/files/papers/p40_fullpaper.pdf

2.2 Destination Loyalty

The concept of loyalty is a concept that has existed for centuries. In ancient times loyalty was used to enhance control and power. The powerful generals of the Ancient Roman Empire used loyalty to gain political power for the armies or in order to oust empires (Kumar & Shah, 2004). In the 21st century loyalty is considered an activity which companies carry out to protect the market shares they have achieved by establishing customer loyalty. Customer loyalty is considered a significant gain in competitive markets (Srivastava, Sherwani, & Fahey, 2000).

Customer loyalty is "the sincere commitment of a consumer to continue to purchase a preferred product/service in the future" (Oliver, 1999). According to Lee and Cunningham (2001) customer loyalty is the tendency of customers based on previous experiences and their expectations for the future to be customers of the existing suppliers again. In other words it is a display of attitude of customers in terms of product categories, brands, stores and services (Uncles, Grahame, & Hammond, 2003).

Literature indicates that there are various definitions regarding customer loyalty and that there is no full consensus. An examination of the different definitions by various authors indicates that another definition for customer loyalty may be evident. Customer loyalty can be referred to "repeated purchase, positive attitudes, long term commitment, intention of continuing the affiliation, positive word-of-mouth advertising" (Sramek, Mentzer, & Stank, 2008).

In marketing literature most writers separate customer loyalty into three dimensions. These are the behavioral dimension (loyalty), attitudinal dimension (loyalty) and combined dimension which is a combination of them both. These dimensions are also measures which measure customer loyalty. It is recommended that enterprises who wish to establish and maintain real and long term customer loyalty take both dimensions into consideration and adopt an approach which combines these two dimensions.

Traditionally customer loyalty has been defined as a behavioral scale. This scale consists of the amount of purchase, the probability of a repeated purchase of the product, repeated purchase behavior as well as frequency of purchase. All these scales are helpful for marketers in measuring behavioral loyalty (Kumar & Shah, 2004). Attitudinal loyalty is a repeated purchase by a customer and recommend it to others (Kandampully & Suhartanto, 2000). Attitudinal loyalty is an approach which benefits from the use of attitudinal data consisting of psychological and affective commitment which are inherent in the nature of loyalty (Değermen, 2006, p. 78). According to Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds (2000) attitudinal loyalty is defined as the tendency a customers has in terms of a brand which includes commitment and word-of-mouth advertising.

In literature it is emphasized that neither behavioral nor attitudinal dimensions alone are sufficient to measure customer loyalty. For this reason authors recommend the combined approach which is a combination of behavioral and attitudinal loyalty. The significance of this approach is emphasized in measuring true loyalty (Selvi, 2007, p. 39).

In order to be able to speak of true customer loyalty the customer must present the following behavior patterns (Değermen, 2006, p. 79):

- Display repeated purchase behavior on a regular basis
- Purchase not only a single product and service of the enterprise but in time also purchase other goods and services (cross-sales)
- Recommend the enterprise to others

- Remain uninfluenced by the efforts of competitive other enterprises.

The level of loyalty of tourists to a given destination is expressed in their intention to revisit the destination and their intention of recommend the destination to others (Oppermann, 2000).
For this reason the components of the intention to revisit and recommendations to others are used in the measuring of destination loyalty. The positive experiences tourists have at a tourism destination will not only enhance their intent to revisit the destination, it will also ensure that they say positive things about the destination to their friends and/or relatives. Likewise, word-of-mouth advertising is an important source of information for potential tourists. (Chi & Qu, 2008).

2.3 Destination Image and Destination Loyalty

It is a known fact that destination image has an impact on the selection and perception tourists have in terms of a destination. Image will have an impact on the destination selection process of tourists, the post-selection assessment of the destination and whether they will prefer the destination in the future (Chi & Qu, 2008). The effect of destination image on the selection of a destination has been studied by various authors (Goodall, 1988; Gartner, 1989; Crompton & Ankomah, 1993). It is indicated that a positive destination image has an impact on the destination selection process (Chi & Qu, 2008).
Destination image also affects the behavioral intention of tourists (Chi & Qu, 2008). According to Tasci and Gartner (2007) destination image affects many consumer behaviors such as the intention to revisit, recommend or revisit a destination. Similarly Chi and Qu (2008) have also alleged that a positive image has an impact on tourist satisfaction and the behavioral intentions of tourists. Dick and Basu (1994) indicate that the image of a destination has a positive effect on the attitudes of consumers and thus establishes loyalty.
A study carried out by Court and Lupton (1997) revealed that destination image had a positive impact on the intention of visitors to revisit the destination. A study carried out by Bigne et al. (2001) concluded that tourism image affected the preference of a destination, recommendation and satisfaction. The study carried out by Choi et al. (2011) on Russian tourists in Korea that destination image had an impact on destination loyalty. With the study carried out by Chen and Tsai (2007) in Kengtin region of Taiwan it was revealed that there was a significant affiliation between destination image and destination loyalty. The authors manifested that destination image affected the intent to revisit a destination and the tendency to recommend the destination to others.
This study also concluded that there is an affiliation between destination image and destination loyalty as presented in the framework of the above mentioned literature and carried out an application in Alanya district of Antalya which holds a significant place in Turkey in terms of tourism. Within this context the hypothesis of the study is manifested as follows:

Hypothesis: Destination image has a significant impact in the establishment of destination loyalty regarding Alanya district of Antalya.

3. Methodology

The population used to determine the impact of destination image on destination loyalty consisted of the tourists who visited Alanya district of Antalya province between the months of June and August. Instead of using all the individuals in the population the "convenience sampling" method in which those individuals who were willing participated in the sampling (Yıldırım, Altunışık, Çoşkun, & Bayraktaroğlu, 2001; Ural & Kılıç, 2011). Accordingly the size of the sampling was calculated with the formula $n = \sigma^2 . Z_\alpha^2 / d^2$ recommended for large populations and quantitative research (NEA, 1965; Sekaran, 2003). The formula was established with the parameters derived from a pilot application of 30 people in which standard deviation was σ=1; maximum difference allowed between population and sampling effect size d=0,10 and α=0,05 theoretical values corresponding to significance level was taken as $Z_{0,05}$=1,96 and minimum sampling size calculated with the formula was 385. Within this framework to account for incomplete, erroneous and unreturned survey forms which were used as a data collection technique the application cover 420 persons and a total of 393 survey forms were assessed.
The survey used as a data collection tool consisted of three parts. The first part of the survey of the study for destination loyalty measuring was dedicated to the individual characteristics of the participants (nationally, gender, age, educational level, profession, income level), the second part was devoted to the destination image scale consisting of 17 articles and two basic dimensions (cognitive, affective) and the third part was committed to 6 articles and two dimensions (intention to revisit, recommend) . The cognitive dimension of the destination image scale consisted of five sub-dimensions (natural attractiveness, infrastructure, atmosphere, social environment and value for money). While the scales used by Baloğlu and Mangaloğlu (2001), Parker, Morrison,

and Ismail (2003), Byon and Zhang (2010) were employed in the study regarding destination image, the scales used by Bridson, Evans, and Hickman (2008), Pike, Bianchi, Keer, and Pati (2010) in their studies were used for destination loyalty. The survey form containing the individual characteristics and relevant scales was translated into German, English and Russian and applied. Each item in the scales was subjected to the Likert (1961, 1967) style of grading; and participants' views were scored as “Strongly disagree=1”, “Disagree=2”, “Neutral=3”, “Agree=4” and “Strongly agree=5”.

Arithmetical averages and standard deviation values were calculated in order to portray the views of the participants in terms of destination image and destination loyalty in the study. In addition the Pearson correlation analysis was applied to determine the relationship between destination image and destination loyalty and a simple multivariable linear regression model was established to determine the cause and effect relationship between the variables. On the other hand factor analysis was applied for the structure validity of image and destination loyalty scales and Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients were calculated to test the reliability of the internal consistency in the study. SPSS 17.0 for Windows software program was used in the analysis of the obtained data.

4. Study Findings

The distribution of the personal characteristics of the individuals in the sampling group of the study are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Distribution of The Participants According to Their Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Group	Number (f)	Percentage(%)
Nationality	German	167	42,5
	Russian	106	27,0
	Other (Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, etc.)	120	30,5
Gender	Female	193	49,1
	Male	200	50,9
Marital status	Married	197	50,1
	Single	196	49,9
Age	Below 20	20	5,1
	21-30	111	28,2
	31-40	104	26,5
	41-50	63	16,0
	51-60	59	15,0
	61 and above	36	9,2
Educational level	Elementary school and under	42	10,7
	High School	140	35,6
	Associate degree	127	32,3
	Undergraduate	64	16,3
	Postgraduate	20	5,1
Profession	Laborer	139	35,4
	Self employment	80	20,4
	Public servant	31	7,8
	Retired	37	9,4
	Student	47	12,0
	Other (housewife, unemployed, etc.)	59	15,0
Income level	Below 1000 €	62	15,8
	1001-2000 €	129	32,8
	2001-3000 €	155	39,4
	3001€ and over	47	12,0
Whether they had visited Alanya previously	yes	270	68,7
	no	123	31,3
Who accompanied them to Alanya	Alone	33	8,4
	With my friends	117	29,8
	With my family	144	36,6
	With my partner	99	25,2
How they arrived in Alanya	Individually	141	35,9
	Package tour	252	64,1
	Total	**393**	**100,0**

According to the findings in Table 3 42,5% of the participants consisted of tourists who were German nationals, 27% were Russian and 30,5% nationalities (Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian etc.). 49,1% of the participants were female, 50,1% were married, 59,8% were 40 of age and under, 46,3% had a high school education and under while 51,4% had a monthly income of 2001€ and over. 31,3% of the tourists who participated in the survey indicated that they were in Alanya for the first time while 36,6% were accompanied by their families and 64,1% had arrived with a packaged tour.

The results of the factor analysis and reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) applied in the study for the destination image and destination loyalty scales and the arithmetical averages and standard deviation values for the views of the participants in terms of destination image and destination loyalty are presented in Table 4. As a result of the factor analysis it is concluded that the eigenvalue of the destination image scale is more than 1 and

that the factors explaining 76,690% of the total variance are collected under six factors while 75,752% of the total variance for the destination loyalty scale are collected under two factors. The first five factors of the cognitive image dimension regarding the destination image scale explain 61,994% of the total variance. All the factor loads and item-total correlations regarding the articles are above the value of 0,40. On the other hand the Bartlett's test results of the factor analysis applied on the scales reveal that factor analysis is applicable ($p<0,01$) and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin values reveal that the level of the sampling volume is sufficient. In addition it has been determined all of the calculated Cronbach's Alpha values of the scales and sub-scales are over 0,70. These values show that the internal consistency levels of the scales are sufficient.

A study of the arithmetical averages in Table 4 reveals that the general destination image ($\overline{X}$=3,92) and general destination loyalty ($\overline{X}$=3,95) points are over 3 points which is a median value in the 1-5 point interval. These values show that the tourists in the sampling group have a positive opinion of the destination image of Alanya and that their levels of destination loyalty are also high. While it has been determined that the arithmetical average values of "cognitive image" ($\overline{X}$=3,94) and "affective image" ($\overline{X}$=3,91) regarding destination image are close to each other, the "social environment" ($\overline{X}$=4,05) factor has been calculated as the most positive outlook for the cognitive image dimension. This finding shows that image of Alanya is perceived as a place where the locals are friendly, helpful and that Alanya is perceived as a safe city. In addition, although the "natural attractions" ($\overline{X}$=3,80) factor of the cognitive image dimension is considered positive by the participants it has been ascertained that the average values calculated for this factor are lower than for the other factors. On the other hand it has been determined that the average points for "recommend" ($\overline{X}$=4,04) in terms of destination loyalty are higher than the average points for "revisiting" ($\overline{X}$=3,87).

TABLE 4. Item, Subscale, and Total Scale Statistics for Destination Image and Loyalty Scale

Scales, Subscales and items	Factor loadings	Item-scale correlation	Eigenvalues	% of variance	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean (1-5) (± SD)
DESTINATION IMAGE				**76,690**	**0,897**	**3,92±0,58**
Cognitive image				***61,994***	***0,809***	***3,94±0,64***
Natural Attractions			*4,235*	*24,911*	*0,768*	*3,80±0,72*
Alanya has sufficient natural parks.	0,879	0,543				3,68±0,91
Alanya has sufficient natural beauty areas.	0,745	0,567				3,82±0,83
Alanya has a sufficient number of historical sites and museums.	0,771	0,598				3,89±0,86
General infrastructure			*2,806*	*16,505*	*0,755*	*3,98±0,70*
Alanya has quality accommodation facilities.	0,677	0,454				4,07±0,86
Alanya has an adequate tourism /tourist information network.	0,765	0,583				3,95±0,86
Alanya has standard hygiene and cleanliness conditions.	0,774	0,544				3,93±0,91
Atmosphere			*1,183*	*6,957*	*0,760*	*3,93±0,72*
Alanya has beautiful beaches.	0,457	0,468				3,94±0,97
Alanya has an attractive night life (entertainment).	0,554	0,495				3,91±0,86
Alanya has adequate sports and entertainment areas.	0,428	0,433				3,93±0,85
Social Environment			*1,156*	*6,798*	*0,723*	*4,05±0,71*
The people of Alanya are friendly and helpful.	0,489	0,423				4,15±0,82
Alanya is generally a safe city.	0,502	0,454				3,95±0,84
Value for Money			*1,160*	*6,823*	*0,802*	*3,93±1,01*
Accommodation prices in Alanya are reasonable.	0,501	0,562				4,17±0,86
Alanya is an affordable city.	0,421	0,579				3,70±0,94
I can get value for the money I pay in Alanya for a holiday.	0,433	0,461				3,91±0,80
Affective image			***2,498***	***14,696***	***0,813***	***3,91±0,67***
Alanya is an lively city.	0,768	0,554				3,88±0,80
Alanya is an exciting city.	0,789	0,488				3,86±0,81
Alanya is a pleasant city.	0,633	0,498				3,97±0,86
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy: KMO = 0,854; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: χ^2 = 5674,5; P = 0,000						
DESTINATION LOYALTY				**75,752**	**0,816**	**3,95±0,78**
Intention to revisit			***1,645***	***28,966***	***0,758***	***3,87±0,92***
If I revisit Turkey my first choice will be Alanya.	0,689	0,465				3,80±1,07
I am considering revisiting Alanya in the future.	0,708	0,478				3,91±0,98
The probability that I come to Alanya again for holidays is high.	0,678	0,599				3,88±1,04
Recommend			***2,657***	***46,786***	***0,793***	***4,04±0,79***
I will say positive things about Alanya to those around me.	0,889	0,446				4,04±0,94
I will encourage those around me to come to Alanya.	0,834	0,502				4,06±0,92
I will recommend Alanya to other people.	0,856	0,465				4,02±0,88
When asked about a holiday destination I will recommend Alanya.	0,871	0,509				4,05±0,91
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy: KMO = 0,832; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: χ^2 = 6678,9; P = 0,000						

The results of the Pearson correlation analysis applied for the relationship between destination image and destination loyalty in the study are presented in Table 5. According to the findings in Table 5 the correlation coefficients between the scales and sub-scales of destination image and destination loyalty are all positive and significant (p<0,01). An examination of the Pearson correlation among the variables reveals that there is a strong positive relationship (0,60<r<0,79) between destination image and destination loyalty (r=0,698; p<0,01). On the other hand, the relationship between cognitive image and destination loyalty (r=0,683) was found to be higher than affective image (r=0,579). This shows that cognitive image has a greater impact in the establishment of loyalty. However, in comparison with the other factors contained within the cognitive image, the factor which has the most impact on destination loyalty is "natural attractions" (r=0,647) while the factor with the least impact was "value for money" (r=0,304). In addition the correlation coefficients in Table 5 show that destination image

and its sub-dimensions had a greater impact on the "recommend" factor in comparison with the "revisiting" factor for destination loyalty.

TABLE 5. Correlation Coefficients in Terms of The Relationship Between Destination Image and Destination Loyalty

Variable	*Intention to revisit*	*Recommend*	DESTINATION LOYALTY
DESTINATION IMAGE	0,623*	0,691*	0,698*
Cognitive image	0,609*	0,676*	0,683*
Natural attractions	0,592*	0,625*	0,647*
Infrastructure	0,579*	0,620*	0,637*
Atmosphere	0,534*	0,611*	0,607*
Social environment	0,570*	0,609*	0,627*
Value for money	0,268*	0,313*	0,304*
Affective image	0,519*	0,574*	0,579*

$^{*}p<0,001$

The results of he simple regression analysis carried out in order to establish the impact of the general destination image which is treated as an independent variable in the study on destination loyalty which is a dependent variable are presented in Table 6; the results for the multivariable linear regression analysis applied regarding the impact of destination image sub-dimensions on destination loyalty are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 6. The Results of A Simple Linear Regression Analysis Regarding The Relationship Between Destination Image and Destination Loyalty

Independent variable	b_i	$S(b_i)$	t	p	ANOVA
Constant	0,742	0,120	3,372	0,001*	F=217,861
General Destination Image	0,819	0,056	14,760	0,000*	P=0,000*

$^{*}p<0,01$ b_j: coefficient $S(b_j)$: Standard error $R^2=0,487$

According to the findings in Table 6 the linear regression model between the variables has been found to be significant (F=217,861; p<0,01). The calculated value of R^2=0,487 explains the ratio; in other words that 48,7% of the changes related to destination loyalty are explained by destination image. Accordingly the regression model can be established as follows. This model reveals that an increase of one unit for destination image ensures an increase of 0,819 with destination loyalty.

Destination Loyalty = 0,742 + 0,819 x Destination Image

TABLE 7. Analysis Results of Multi-Variable Linear Regression for The Relationship Between Destination Image Sub-Dimensions and Destination Loyalty

Independent Variables	b_i	$S(b_i)$	t	p	ANOVA
Constant	0,162	0,120	2,136	0,032*	F=52,494 P=0,000*
Cognitive Image Natural attractions	0,263	0,052	5,066	0,000*	
Infrastructure	0,212	0,058	3,651	0,000*	
Atmosphere	0,153	0,056	2,733	0,007*	
Social environment	0,197	0,060	3,301	0,001*	
Value for money	0,080	0,018	2,146	0,045*	
Affective Image	0,127	0,058	2,199	0,028*	

$^{*}p<0,05;$ $R^2=0,514$

The findings in Table 7 show that the multi-variable linear regression model between the variables is significant (F=52,494; p<0,01). In addition, it is evident that the coefficient pertaining to the sub-dimensions of the destination image have a significant impact on the regression model (p<0,05). The calculated value of R^2=0,514 reveals that 51,4% of the model are explained by the sub-dimensions of destination image (natural attractions -NA-, infrastructure-IF-, atmosphere-AT-, social environment-SE-, value for money -VM- and affective image -AI-). An examination of the t values of the coefficients with an impact on the model reveals that the most

significant image factor sequence with an impact on destination loyalty are "natural attractions", "infrastructure" and "social environment". This result supports the findings obtained from the correlation analysis. Accordingly a multi-variable linear regression model for the estimation of destination loyalty-DL- can be established as follows.

$$DL = 0,162+0,263xNA+0,212xIF+0,153xAT+0,197xSE+0,080xVM+0,127xAI$$

The results obtained from the correlation and regression analysis of the study support the hypothesis "The destination image of Alanya district of Antalya has a significant impact on the establishment of destination loyalty" of the study.

5. Discussion And Conclusions

The concept of image has been studied in marketing literature for long years. The concept of image was first included in studies about tourism in the early 1970's. Particularly the analysis and measuring of the images of touristic destinations is significant in terms of understanding tourist behavior. The reason for this is that destination image has an impact on the selection of a destination by tourists as well as their perception. In addition, destination image has a significant impact on tourists revisiting a destination and in their recommend their destination to others.

In this study which endeavored to determine the impact of destination image on destination loyalty it was determined that the tourists in the sampling group had above average positive perceptions about the destination image of Alanya as well as above average levels of destination loyalty. It is evident in literature that very few such studies have been regarding Alanya. With a study carried out about Alanya by İnan, Akıncı, Kıymalıoğlu and Akyürek (2011) it was revealed that cruise ship tourists visiting Alanya had a positive destination image perception of Alanya. In addition, various studies carried out in different destinations in Turkey as well as in the general province of Antalya with which Alanya is connected to indicates that the perceived destination image is positive (Aksu et al., 2008; İlban et al., 2008; İlban & Bezirgan, 2011).

While it is determined that the perceptions of "cognitive image" and "affective image" related to destination image are close to each other the most positive perception of the cognitive image dimension belongs to the "social environment" factor. In addition, although the "natural attractions" factor of the cognitive image dimension may be perceived as positive by the participants the perception determined for this factor is more negative than the other factors. These results indicate that although the image of Alanya is perceived as a city with friendly and helpful locals and a safe city it also indicates that there is just a hint of criticism regarding the natural attractions. The studies which are available in literature show both similar as well as different results.

İnan et al. (2011) also achieved similar results in a study carried out in Alanya district. The authors indicated that most positive perception of the cognitive image dimensions was given to the "security" factor while the most negative perception was dedicated to the "cultural and historical attractions" factor. These results obtained by the authors resemble the results of this study. These results may be due to the fact that the tourists in Alanya district usually are accommodated within the scope of the all inclusive system and as such do not have the opportunity to visit the natural beauties, historical and cultural sites of the destinations they are visiting.

A study carried out by Çoban (2012) in Cappadocia revealed that the most positive perception of the cognitive image dimensions was "cultural attractions" while the most negative factor was perceived as "touristic atmosphere". A study executed by Lin, Morais, Kerstetter, and Hou (2007) in Taichung revealed that the most positive perception in the cognitive image dimension appeared to be "natural attractions" while the most negative perception was dedicated to the "infrastructure" factor. All these results show that touristic destinations have different characteristics, different structures or management which results in differences in the image perceptions of tourists.

The study revealed that in terms of destination loyalty the participants had a higher intention of "recommend" Alanya compared to their intention of "revisiting". According to this result it can be surmised that there is a chance that the tourists visiting Alanya might revisit however, even they are unable to do so they will recommend Alanya to people they know. In other words the tourists display affective and psychological loyalty to Alanya. With attitudinal commitment which is described as a customer purchasing a product again and recommend it to others (Kandampully & Suhartanto, 2000) even if a customer does not shop from an enterprise he may continue to be a loyal customer of the enterprise. That is the affective commitment to the enterprise may continue and the enterprise may be recommended to others (Çatı & Koçoğlu, 2008).

The study determined that there is a strong positive relationship between destination image and destination loyalty. In addition, it has been revealed that the "recommend" factor of destination image and sub-dimensions is affected more in comparison to the "revisit" factor of destination loyalty. The results obtained in this study are supported by the results of numerous studies in literature which have been carried out in order to study the

relationship and impact of destination image and loyalty of tourists in terms of a destinations (Court & Lupton, 1997; Bignie, 2001; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Chi & Qu, 2008; Prayag, 2008; Alqurneh, 2010; Choi et al., 2011; Lerputtarak, 2012). A study carried out by Chen and Tsai (2007) in Taiwan's Kengtin region revealed that there is a significant relationship between destination image and destination loyalty. The authors determined that destination image has an impact on the intention to revisit a destination and the tendency to recommend it to others.

In a study carried out by Lerputtarak (2012) with 500 foreign tourists in Thailand Pattaya showed that there is a positive relationship of average level between destination image and the intent to revisit a destination. Similarly in a study carried out by Court and Lupton (1997) it was determined that destination image had a positive impact on the intent to revisit a destination. Bigne et al. (2001) determined a significant relationship between image and intent to revisit and recommend.

In the study it was discovered that the relationship between cognitive image and destination loyalty was higher than affective image. This finding shows that cognitive image has more impact in establishing loyalty. The study revealed that the most effective factor regarding destination loyalty compared to the other factors comprising cognitive image was "natural attractions". There is no doubt that the main elements comprising a touristic product are headed by natural attractions. Many authors indicate that natural attractions are significant for both a touristic destination as well as the tourists in terms of assessing the destination and preferring it (Hunt, 1975; Peters & Weiermair, 2000; Deng, King, & Bauer, 2002; Wirt, Pröbslt, & Haider, 2009).

Very many elements are important for a touristic destination. One of these is the element of image. The reason for this is that image will enable a tourist to establish certain impressions in his mind about a destination he has visited or intends to visit in the future. If the image of a destination is perceived as positive this will have an impact on the probability, of tourists to revisit the destination and in recommend this destination to others. Customer loyalty will emerge as a result of these characteristics. One of the main advantages of loyal customers are the increased profits ensured by repeated visits. In addition, by spreading word of mouth positive advertising loyal customers may be instrumentative in the preference of a destination by potential tourists on the market. For this reason destination managers must take care to protect and develop the features which make up the image of a destination (natural attractions, infrastructure, atmosphere, etc.). In addition, not only managers but the local population and tourism operators have great responsibilities as well. Elements such as the attitude of local populations towards tourists or the ability of the tourism operators to give the tourists value for their money will also have an impact on the image of a destination.

References

Aksu, A. A., Özdemir, B., Çizel, B. R., İçigen, T. E., Çizel, B., Ehtiyar, R. (2008). Antalya yöresi turist profili araştırması, Retrieved October 10, 2012,fromhttp://www.poyd.org/istatistikler/PDF/Antalya_Turist_Profili.pdf

Alqurneh, M., Isa, MD, F., & Othman, R. A. (2010). *Tourism destination image, satisfaction and loyalty: A study of the Dead Sea in Jordanian curative tourism*. The Third International Conference on International Studies (ICIS 2010) Hotel Istana Kuala Lumpur. College of Law, Government and International Studies, Universiti Utara Malaysia

Baloglu, Ş., & Mangaloğlu, M. (2001). Tourism destination images of Turkey, Egypt, Greece, and Italy as perceived by US-based tour operators and travel agents. *Tourism Management,* 22, 1-9.

Baloğlu, Ş. (1999). A path analytic model of visitation intention involving information sources, socio-psychological motivations, and destination image. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, *8*(3), 81–91.

Baloğlu, Ş., & McCleary, K. W. (1999). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *26*(4), 868–897.

Bayuk, N. M., & Küçük, F. (2008). İşletme çalışanlarının müşteri olma güdüsü üzerindeki etkisi. *Journal of Yasar University ,3*(11), 1575-1586.

Beerli, A., & Martin, D. J. (2004). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *31*(3), 657–681.

Bigne, J. E., Sanchez, M. I., & Sanchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behavior: Interrelationship. *Tourism Management, 22*(1), 607–616.

Bridson, K., Evans, J., & Hickman, M. (2008). Assessing the relationship between loyalty program attributes, store satisfaction and store loyalty. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 15*(5), 364–374.

Byon, K.K., & Zhang, J. J. (2010). Development of a scale measuring destination image. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 28*(4), 508–532.

Castro, C. B., Armario, E. M., & Ruiz, D. M. (2007). The influence of market heterogeneity on the relationship between a destination's image and tourists' future behaviour. *Tourism Management, 28*(1), 175–187.

Chen, F-C., & Tsai D. C. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions?. *Tourism Management*, *28*(4), 1115–1122.
Chen, J. S., & Uysal, M. (2002). Market positioning analysis: A hybrid approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *29*(4), 987–1003.
Chi Geng-Qing, C., & Qu, H. (2008). Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach. *Tourism Management*, *29*(4), 624–636.
Choi, G. J., Tkachenko, T., & Sil, S. (2011). On the destination image of Korea by Russian tourists. *Tourism Management*, *32*(1), 193–194.
Chon, K. S. (1992). The role of destination image in tourism: An extension. *Revue du Tourisme*, 1, 2–8.
Chon, K-S. (1990). The role of destination image in tourism: A review and discussion. *The Tourist Review*, *45*(2), 2–9.
Coshall, J. T. (2000). Measurement of tourists' images: The repertory grid approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, *39*(1), 85–89.
Court, B. C., & Lupton, R. A. (1997) Customer portfolio development: Modeling destination adopters, inactives, and rejecters. *Journal of Travel Research*, *36*(1), 35–43.
Crompton, J. L., & Ankomah, P. K. (1993). Choice set propositions in destination decisions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *20*(3), 461–476.
Çatı, K., & Koçoğlu, M. C. (2008). Müşteri sadakati ile müşteri tatmini arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19, 167–189.
Çoban, S. (2012) The effects of the image of destination on tourist satisfaction and loyalty: The case of Cappadocia. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *29*(2), 222–232.
Dadgostar, B., & Isotalo, R. M. (1992). Factors affecting time spent by near-home tourists in city destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, *31*(2), 34–39.
Değermen, A. H. (2006). *Hizmet ürünlerinde kalite, müşteri tatmini ve sadakat:* Türkmen Kitabevi: İstanbul
del Bosque, I. A. R., Martin, S. H., & Collado, J. (2006). The role of expectations in the consumer satisfaction formation process: Empirical evidence in the travel agency sector. *Tourism Management*, *27*(3), 410–419.
Deng, J., King, B., & Bauer, T. (2002). Evaluating natural attractions for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(2), 422–438.
Dick, A. S., & Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: Toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 22*(2), 99–113.
Ganesh, J., Arnold M. J., & Reynolds K. E. (2000). Understanding the customer base of service providers: An examination of the difference between switchers and stayers. *Journal of Marketing*, *64*(3), 65–87.
Gartner, W. C. (1989). Tourism image: Attribute measurement of state tourism products using multidimensional scaling techniques. *Journal of Travel Research*, *28*(2), 16–20.
Goodall, B. (1988). How tourists choose their holidays: An analytical framework. İn B. Goodall, ve G. Ashworth (Eds.), marketing in the tourism industry: The promotion of destination regions (pp. 1–17). London: Routledge.
Gunn, C. A. (1972). Vacationscape: Designing tourist regions. *Austin: Bureau of Business Research*, University of Texas.
Hunt, J. D. (1971). *Image: A factor in tourism*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation), Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
Hunt, J. D. (1975). Image as a factor in tourist development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 13, 1–7.
İlban, O. M., & Bezirgan, M. (2011). *Yerli turistlerin destinasyon imajı algılarını belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma*; *Burhaniye örneği*. 12. Ulusal Turizm Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı, Akçakoca-Düzce.
İlban, O. M., Köroğlu, A., & Bozok, D. (2008) Termal turizm amaçlı seyahat eden turistlerde destinasyon imajı: Gönen örneği. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(13), 105 -129.
İnan, A. E., Akıncı, S., Kıymalıoğlu, A., & Akyürek, S. M. (2011). Kruvaziyer turizminde turistlerin tavsiye niyetlerinde destinasyon imajının etkisi. Ege Akademik Bakış /Ege Academıc Revıew, *11*(3), 487–497.
Kandampully, J., & Suhartanto, D. (2000). Customer loyalty in the hotel industry: The role customer satisfaction and image. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *12*(6), 346–351.
Kim, H., & Richardson, S. L. (2003). Motion picture ımpacts on destination images. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *30*(1), 216–237.
Kumar, V., & Shah, D. (2004). Building and sustaining profitable customer loyalty for the 21st Century. *Journal of Retailing*, *80*(4), 317–330.
Lawson, F., & Baud-Bovy, M. (1977). *Tourism and recreational development*. London: Architectural Press.
Lee, M., & Cunningham, Lawrence F. (2001). A cost/benefit approach to understanding service loyalty. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *15*(2), 113–130.

Lertputtarak, S. (2012). The relationship between destination image, food image, and revisiting Pattaya, Thailand. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *7*(5), 111–122.
Likert, R. (1961) *New Patterns of Management.* McGrow-Hill: New York, USA
Likert, R. (1967) *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value.* McGrow-Hill: New York, USA
Lin, H. C., Morais, B. D., Kerstetter, L. D., & Hou, S. J. (2007). Examining the role of cognitive and affective image in predicting choice across natural, developed, and theme park destinations. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*(2), 183–194.
Martin, S. H., & del Bosque, I. A. R. (2008). Exploring the cognitive–affective nature of destination image and the role of psychological factors in its formation. *Tourism Management*, *29(*2), 263–277.
Mayo, E. J. (1973). *Regional ımages and regional travel behavior. research for changing travel patterns: Interpretation and utilization*. In Proceedings of the Travel Research Association, Fourth Annual Conference (pp. 211–218).
Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1995). The role of awareness and familiarity with a destination: the central Florida case. *Journal of Travel Research*, *33*(3), 21–27.
Moon, S. K., Kim, M., & Lee, H. J. (2011). The influence of consumer's event quality perception on destination image. *Managing Service Quality*, *21*(3), 287–303.
NEA (National Education Asociation) (1965). *Sampling and statistic handbook for surveys in education.* National Education Asociation Press: Washington, USA
Nguyen, N., & Leblanc, G. (2001). Corporate image and corporate reputation in customers' retention decisions in services. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *8*(4), 227–236.
Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty?. *Journal of Marketing*, *63*(4), 33–44.
Oppermann, M. (2000). Tourism destination loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, *39*(1),78-84.
Parker, M. A., Morrison, M. A., & Ismai l, A. J. (2003). Dazed and confused? An exploratory study of the image of brazil as a travel destination. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *9*(3), 243-259.
Peters, M., & Weirmair, K. (2000). Tourist attractions and attracted tourists: How to satisfy today's 'fickle' tourist clientele?. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, *11*(1), 22–29.
Petrick, J. F. (2004). Are loyal visitors desired visitors. *Tourism Management*, *25*(5), 463-470.
Pike, S., Bianchi, C., Keer, G., & Patti, C. (2010). Consumer-based brand equity for Australia as a Long-Haul tourism destination in an emerging market. *International Marketing Review*, *27*(4), 434–449.
Prayag G. (2008). Image, satisfaction and loyalty—The Case of Cape Town. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *19*(2), 205–224.
Qu, H., Kim, L. H., & Im, H. H. (2011). A model of destination branding: Integrating the concepts of the branding and destination image. *Tourism Management, 32*(3), 465–476.
Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business.* John Wiley High Education Press: New York, USA
Selvi, S. M. (2007) *Müşteri sadakati*. Detay Yayıncılık: Ankara
Sramek, D. B., Mentzer T. J., & Stank, P. T. (2008). Creating consumer durable retailer customer loyalty through order fulfillment service operations. *Journal of Operations Management*, *26*(6), 781–797.
Srivastava, Rajendra K., Sherwani, Tassaduq A., & Fahey, L. (2000). Market-based assets and shareholder value: A framework for analysis. *Journal of Marketing*, *62*(1), ss.2–18.
Stepchenkova, S., & Morrison, M. A. (2008). Russia's destination image among American pleasure travelers: Revisiting Echtner and Ritchie. *Tourism Management*, *29*(3), 548–560.
Tasci, A. D. A., & Gartner, W. C. (2007). Destination image and its functional relationships. *Journal of Travel Research, 45*(4), 413–425.
Uncles, Mark D., Grahame R. D., & Hammond, K. (2003). Customer loyalty and customer loyalty programs. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *20*(4), 294–316.
Ural A., & Kılıç, İ. (2011). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve spss ile veri analizi.* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
Wang, Y-C., Lin, W-R., Yeh, Pi-H., & Liu, C-R. (2011). *The role of image in formatin of destination loyalty at leisure farm: Difference between first-time and repeat visitors*. 2nd International Conference on Sustainable Tourism Management of TDS, MJU, Thailand.
Wirth, V., Pröbstl, U., & Haider, W. (2009). *Destination choice in alpine summer tourism: heterogeneity of preferences and the role of protected areas*. 4th Symposium o fthe Hohe Tauern National Park Research in Protected Areas September, Castle of Kaprun.
Yıldırım E., Altunışık R., Coşkun R., & Bayraktaroğlu S. (2001). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri.* Adapazarı: Sakarya Kitabevi.